Attendees

➢ Wilbur Rehmann – MCJISP DOJ	➢ Carl Hotvedt - ITSD
➢ Dan Chelini – MT Supreme Court	➢ Margaret Jennings Jeffrey – OTD ESB
➢ Bruce Coensgen – MTDOJ ITSD	➢ Kim Randall – MTDOJ ITSD
➢ Jim Dolezal – Missoula County	➢ Dana Corson – MT Supreme Court
➢ Bill Griffenberg - MTDOJ ITSD	➢ Fred McCracken – Billings PD
➢ Larry Fasbender – MTDOJ	➢ Janet Jessup – Northrop Grumman

Review of Standardized Data Elements List

Wilbur handed out the current list of standardized data elements for data exchange as approved by the subcommittee last fall. He said that one of the questions that had come up about the list was how it compares to data dictionary at the local government level. Wilbur met with Art Pembroke and his staff to go over their data dictionary for the new Lewis & Clark system. Wilbur handed out a list of the items that are on the standardized list but not on Lewis & Clark's dictionary. Some of the items missing may be close but not exact matches because they are phrased differently. The list of missing items in the local data dictionary is very short when compared to the full standardized list, so the standardized list appears to follow closely with this local data dictionary.

 Jim Dolezal thought that the Missoula County data dictionary would also be a very close match, and he agreed to do a comparison. Fred McCracken said he would do the comparison for the Billings PD data dictionary. Wilbur said he would follow up with L&C County and see if some of the items are included under different names.

A question was brought up about what would be done with any differences between the statewide list and the local dictionaries. Fred said he would look at his list and see if there are any "showstoppers" that should be on the local data dictionary but are not currently included.   He would include "citation" a showstopper, as an example.

Wilbur asked Janet Jessup to present a summary of the national Justice XML Data Dictionary (JXDD Version 3.0 pre-release, sponsored by USDOJ Global) and the changes to the data dictionary since last year's version.   A summary sheet was handed out as well as power-point presentations by USDOJ Bureau of Justice Assistance concerning version 3.0. She indicated that the new dictionary is substantially more comprehensive in the types of criminal justice interests represented. It has also been updated to meet XML design standards and includes significantly more elements. Version 3.0 offers an option for a nationally based standard that was not available when the subcommittee's workgroup began work on the state's data elements last summer.

Discussion of Next Steps

The subcommittee began to discuss the option of adopting the JXDD Version 3.0 as the state's data dictionary. The existing standardized list could be reviewed as possible mandatory elements that would be adopted as a MCJISP mandate by the Executive members (Governor, Attorney General, and Supreme Court Justice).

Wilbur asked the subcommittee members how they wanted to proceed. Dan Chelini asked what the impact would be of adopting these standards: immediate or future development? Wilbur said it was likely to be applicable to future development or revisions.

Fred said he liked the JXDD list as the overall standard with a focus on the shorter list as the key focus for all systems. Jim Dolezal said the national vendors will be using to the national data dictionary anyway so that it makes sense to adopt it. Fred said he was still concerned about those jurisdictions that cannot afford new systems or revisions to existing systems. He sees this as a state problem and he suggested that the subcommittee needed to think about implementation across the state; he suggested regional data collection points as a possible option. Jim also thought that MTDOJ could consider providing a system for small jurisdictions, perhaps web-based.

Larry Fasbender said that there are two steps to be considered: first to set standards, and second to look at the use and funding issues. He said that interoperability is an important factor and that is reflected in the national standard. Fred said that if the state goes after federal money, we can point out that we have adopted the USDOJ standard.

Wilbur mentioned that there is an analogy to the adoption of the CJIS Security Policy that the subcommittee adopted earlier. The state is not in 100% compliance but is working towards that goal; adoption of the national data dictionary could be done with the same objective.

Wilbur said there is still a decision to be made on whether the normalized list will be mandatory. Jim said this is a moving standard – it will change with time, and required elements and definitions may change, but all major vendors will be going in this direction.

Wilbur said he would wait to get the information from the three local jurisdictions on the comparisons with the standardized list; then the subcommittee can decide which of the elements are mandatory. It was pointed out that these were the elements that are commonly exchanged among members of the criminal justice community. Jim Dolezal said that eventually the goal is that there is one master source for data and not secondary sources.

Dana Corson said a mechanism or process is needed to make sure that the updates in the data dictionaries are available easily. Janet suggested the MTDOJ/MCJISP web site

could provide a link to the Global page that will have the latest version since Global is acting as the national registry for integrated justice standards.

Wilbur will go through the process that will be needed to map the standardized list to the new data dictionary. He will send out the information from the three jurisdictions to all subcommittee members.

Security Issues
Wilbur provided some additional information on the state's level of compliance with the CJIS Security Policy. The CJIS Bureau indicated that the only area of non-compliance was the encryption requirement. Bill Griffenberg indicated that they are now looking at using a contractor to bring the state in compliance by August. They will be using a VPN client and the state will bring the client to the locals so that no changes will have to be done at the local level. CJIN terminals are currently secure.

Carl Hotvedt asked Bill when the state would be publishing a minimum requirements list for an increasing number of CJIN users. Bill indicated that there are concerns about making sure access is absolutely secure. Carl said that if there were security recommendations available (i.e. published) for local users, then they would know what is expected. Dan pointed out that the information is already available, and Bill confirmed that the information is available. Wilbur pointed out that the problem is local ability to meet the standards. Bill indicated that these concerns are what drove the decision to go to a VPN client.

Wilbur suggested getting a workgroup for security issues, to include at least Carl and Lynn Pizzini.

Next Meeting
The subcommittee set a meeting date of June 18 at 2pm